



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
DWM Oct-08

FREDERICK W. GIBB, III
GIBB & RAHMAN, LLC
2568-A RIVA ROAD
SUITE 304
ANNAPOLIS MD 21401

COPY MAILED

OCT 21 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Fan et al.	:	
Application Number: 10/658623	:	ON PETITION
Filing Date: 09/09/2003	:	
Attorney Docket Number:	:	
YOR920030261US1	:	

This is a decision on the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment filed on October 15, 2008.

This application was held abandoned for failure to timely respond to the final Office action mailed on March 17, 2008, which set a three (3) month shortened statutory period for reply. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on October 7, 2008. On October 15, 2008, the subject petition was filed.

Petitioner requests that the Office withdraw the holding of abandonment due to non-receipt of the final Office action mailed on March 17, 2008. In support of the allegation that the final Office action was never received, petitioner has submitted a copy of the law firm's mail log, docket sheets and docket report. Additionally, petitioners have provided a statement by registered patent practitioner Pamela M. Riley, stating that the final Office action was not shown on these reports because it was not received.

A review of the record indicates no irregularity in the mailing of the final Office action mailed on March 17, 2008, and in the absence of any irregularity in the mailing, there is a strong presumption that the final Office action was properly mailed to the address of record. This presumption may be overcome by a showing that the final Office action was not in fact received.

MPEP 711.03(c) states, in pertinent part:

In Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of Delgar, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of Delgar is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office

action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

(emphasis added)

Accordingly, there was no abandonment in fact. The Notice of Abandonment is hereby vacated and the holding of abandonment withdrawn.

The petition is GRANTED.

The application is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 2129 for remailing of the final Office action mailed on March 17, 2008. The period for reply will be reset from the mailing date thereof.

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned at 571-272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions